

1 The Westfield-Washington Advisory Plan Commission held a meeting on
2 Monday, August 2, 2010 scheduled for 7:00 PM at the Westfield City Hall.

3
4 **Opening of Meeting:** 7:00 PM
5

6 **Roll Call:** Note Presence of a Quorum
7

8 **Commission Members Present:** Dan Degnan, Pete Emigh, William Sanders, Cindy
9 Spoljaric, Bob Spraeztz, Robert Horkay, Steve Hoover, Danielle Tolan.
10

11 **City Staff Present:** Matthew Skelton, Director; Kevin Todd, Senior Planner; Ryan
12 Schafer, Planner; and Brian Zaiger, City Attorney
13

14 **Approval of the Minutes:**
15

16 Motion to approve minutes of July 19, 2010 as presented.
17

18 Motion: Emigh; Second: Hoover; Vote: Pass by Voice Vote
19
20

21 Todd reviewed the public hearing rules and rules of procedure.
22
23

24 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS**
25

26 Case No. APC Order 10-01
27 Petitioner City of Westfield
28 Description Order of the Westfield-Washington Plan Commission determining that
29 the Amended Declaratory Resolution of the Grand Junction Economic
30 Development Area approved and adopted by the Westfield
31 Redevelopment Commission conform to the Comprehensive Plan and
32 approving that amended resolution.
33

34 Zaiger discussed the Order, stating that this is a minor text change and that the
35 Commission needs to re-approve the plan previously approved last year.
36

37 Motion: To approve Order 10-01 as presented.
38

39 Motion: Horkay; Second: Degnan; Vote: 8-0
40

41 **NEW BUSINESS**
42

43 Case No. 1008-DP-06 & 1008-SIT-06
44 Petitioner Friedman Properties, LLC
45 Description 4011 SR 32 East; Petitioner requests a Development Plan and Site Plan

1 Review for a 7,000 square foot multi-tenant commercial building, located
2 on approximately 1 acre in the GB District.
3

4 Todd introduced the petition stating that this item has been to TAC and a few issues are
5 being reviewed and will be resolved before coming back to the Commission for approval.
6

7 Mr. Jon Dobosiewicz, Nelson & Frankenberger, discussed the petition further including
8 site layout, architecture and building materials, landscaping, lighting and signage. He
9 discussed modifications to the plan, including an 8-foot asphalt path which will traverse
10 the site providing access to the Midland Trail further to the south. He also stated that the
11 modified plan allowed three additional parking spaces on the site.
12

13 Spoljaric asked if this could be used as commercial and not just office.
14

15 Todd responded yes; the property is zoned General Business which allows for a wide
16 range of businesses uses.
17

18 A Public Hearing opened at 7:22 p.m.
19

20 No one spoke, and the Public Hearing closed at 7:23 p.m.
21
22

23 Case No.	1008-DP-07 & 1008-SPP-01
24 Petitioner	J. C. Hart Company
25 Description	441 South Union Street; Petitioner requests a Development Plan and
26	Preliminary Plat Review for 238 multi-family dwelling units, located on
27	approximately 18.5 acres in the Union Street Flats PUD District.
28	

29 Todd introduced the petition stating that staff is working with the petitioner on a few
30 issues which will be addressed before this petition comes before the Commission for
31 approval.
32

33 Dobosiewicz provided an overview of the project including site plan, layout, architecture,
34 landscaping, lighting and signage. He discussed the trail system, building elevations, and
35 clubhouse amenities.
36

37 A Public Hearing opened at 7:40 p.m.
38

39 Ms. Judith Shuck expressed concern about preserving Westfield's historical heritage.
40

41 The Public Hearing closed at 7:43 p.m.
42

43 Dobosiewicz responded to public hearing comments, stating that during the rezone
44 process, the petitioner met with neighboring home owners to discuss relocation of
45 historical homes, but there was not enough interest at the time to do so.

1
2
3 Case No. 1008-PUD-10
4 Petitioner KRG Bridgewater, LLC
5 Description Northwest Corner of 146th Street and Gray Road; Petitioner requests an
6 amendment to Section 14 of The Bridgewater PUD; modifying standards
7 regarding wall signage for the Bridgewater Marketplace.
8

9 Todd introduced the petition, which specifically addresses sign standards for the multi-
10 tenant building in the Bridgewater Marketplace. Currently, the PUD Ordinance limits the
11 amount of wall signage, and the request is to consider modifying the Bridgewater
12 standards to match the City standards for similar signage.
13

14 A Public Hearing opened at 8:00 p.m.
15

16 No one spoke, and the Public Hearing closed at 8:01 p.m.
17
18

19 **OLD BUSINESS**
20

21 Case No. 1001-PUD-01
22 Petitioner Estridge Development Company
23 Description 146th Street and Towne Road; Petitioner requests a change in zoning on
24 approximately 1,409 acres from the AG-SF1, SF-2 and Centennial North
25 PUD districts to the Symphony PUD District.
26

27 Skelton addressed previous discussion about ownership/control issues stating that the
28 petitioner has addressed the requirements in order to be eligible for consideration as a
29 PUD.
30

31 Hoover stated that the petitioner previously made a presentation and he is still waiting for
32 a copy.
33

34 Skelton stated that he has received the presentation and will get it uploaded to the
35 website.
36

37 Skelton reviewed the detailed comments received from APC members as well as staff.
38 He stated that the petitioner is aware of items which need to be updated or revised so
39 these will not be covered during the meeting.
40

41 Skelton began discussing the PUD Comments by Section:
42

43 Page 1: Item 12BI, this standard limits the overall number of units in the whole
44 development. He noted that staff asked for a specific number so we know when we have
45 crossed it. He mentioned that one thing it does not address is a limit on accessory

1 dwelling units, which is a new concept that Westfield has not seen before, and is an
2 essential element to this proposal.

3
4 Spoljaric asked the petitioner to address this issue.

5
6 Hoover believes that there should be some limit or some expectation.

7
8 Mr. Paul Estridge, Jr. responded on the issue of accessory dwelling units. He stated that
9 in this type of development, it is not uncommon to have detached garages or an apartment
10 above the garage. He added that Estridge Companies understands there is a need for
11 some type of boundaries; therefore he offered that no more than 35% of any one lot size
12 category would be able to have an accessory dwelling unit. He said that he would have
13 no issue to limiting the maximum number of dwelling units in the PUD. He suggested
14 capping the total dwelling units to 4,112 units, as proposed in the PUD ordinance.

15
16 Skelton added that the proposed PUD ordinance has the limit Estridge mentioned of
17 4,112 unit maximum, but he believes that is for primary dwelling units, and that number
18 can be modified to include the accessory dwelling units.

19
20 Estridge discussed the allowance for more single family detached homes rather than
21 multi-family and offered the following restrictions to the PUD:

- 22 • Cottage Lot Category: minimum of 100 and maximum of 400 cottage lots at 600
23 sq. ft.
- 24 • Narrow Lot Category: range of 200 to 600 narrow lots; minimum sq. ft. of 1,000.
- 25 • Small Lot Category: minimum number of 600 but no maximum; minimum home
26 1,400. sq. ft.
- 27 • House Lot Category: minimum of 400 with no limit; 1800 sq. ft.
- 28 • Estate Lot Category: 200 with no limit; 2400 sq. ft.
- 29 • Maximum number of attached units is 1,440 units, and within that category of
30 attached, maximum of 600 rentals, balance could be duplexes, triplexes, quads,
31 townhomes or flats.

32
33 Spoljaric still questioned the number of cottage and narrow lots. She commented that she
34 thinks that is a lot of homes on very small lots.

35
36 Estridge understands this concern and offered no more than a certain percentage of
37 attached, cottage, and narrow lots throughout the entire development at any given time.
38 He suggested that a discussion take place regarding how much attached and very small
39 lots are appropriate for the entire development, in a gross number.

40
41 Spoljaric believes that it is very difficult to review without having defining land uses and
42 more descriptive land uses per village area.

43
44 Degnan asked if it is possible to include timelines, instead of village by village, present it
45 by time frame of village build outs, then over time the balance could be reached. He

1 further explained, instead of going village by village so that we do not get stuck with a
2 certain percentage of types of lots, instead, by a certain time there would be a certain
3 percentage of each type of lot, which gives flexibility but keeps the commitment.

4
5 Skelton stated that a detailed phasing plan is required by the PUD; however, it is not
6 binding. He suggested that the petitioner may be able to tell the APC what housing
7 product will be there rather than when.

8
9 Degnan further explained his idea stating that instead of going village by village so that
10 we do not get stuck with a certain percentage of types of lots, instead, by a certain time
11 there would be a certain percentage of each type of lot, which gives flexibility but keeps
12 the commitment.

13
14 Estridge reviewed the current time line.

15
16 Hoover asked about accessory dwelling units, stating that the language sounds like a unit
17 would be allowed to be owned either by the main property owner or it could be a separate
18 owner.

19
20 Estridge responded that there would be one deed to the lot and same owner.

21
22 Estridge offered to exclude the accessory dwelling in the cottage lot single family
23 dwelling. He further stated that the accessory dwelling units are only applicable to single
24 family detached lots.

25
26 Spoljaric stated that this is not how the PUD reads.

27
28 Skelton said that this would be reviewed and clarified.

29
30 Estridge stated that the petitioner is not asking for any accessory dwelling units in the
31 attached or live-work categories.

32
33 The Commission took a ten-minute break.

34
35 Degnan left at 8:55 p.m.

36
37 Skelton stated that during the break, he reviewed the accessory dwelling unit verbiage
38 and confirmed that a prohibition of accessory units in attached and live-work scenario
39 does not exist.

40
41 Horkay found related verbiage under Permitted Uses, C, page 21, which he suggested
42 will need to be modified.

43

1 Skelton stated that the next item to be discussed is Item 1 II B at bottom of page one; he
2 believes that this is the time for discussion regarding how this project relates to the
3 comprehensive plan.

4
5 Spoljaric state that she would like to see the highest and best use of areas which can be
6 maximized to help offset property taxes.

7
8 Estridge reviewed the maximums and limitations regarding the commercial use square
9 footage. He also discussed possible types of commercial uses.

10
11 Estridge offered an analysis on the draw, the market area for the retail and viability for
12 this amount of commercial. He added that he would be glad to provide that for the next
13 meeting.

14
15 Discussion followed regarding what the Commission is looking for in analysis, and it was
16 determined they are not so interested in what the market will bear as they are in real life
17 examples of what something this size "feels like."

18
19 Estridge added that it is really roof tops and traffic, average trips per day, that really drive
20 commercial development.

21
22 Hoover stated that the Commission needs to consider what the community wants in that
23 location and what was envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan.

24
25 Hoover stated that he would like "big box retail" excluded. He would also like to see
26 maximum square footage for a single retail use.

27
28 Skelton pointed out that there is quite a bit of flexibility built into the commercial
29 development standards and encouraged the Commission to review this section.

30
31 Discussion followed regarding grocery stores, sizes, and the future needs or desires of the
32 community.

33
34 Estridge stated that they will probably come back with a proposal in the neighborhood of
35 80,000 to 100,000 square feet for a grocery, which is the footprint large stores are using
36 today.

37
38 Spoljaric believes that the open space is fragmented and not very high quality.

39
40 Estridge stated that the Three Mile Park is clearly the backbone of the intended open
41 space.

42
43 Estridge believes that it might be a good idea to give more detail on a larger scale
44 conceptually of what would be coming forward on the Village I plat.

45

1 Spoljaric stated that this may be potentially helpful, but depending on the mix in terms of
2 kind of lots. She said that Symphony is going to need different degrees of amenities, and
3 that she is not seeing the defining character in the proposal that accompanies amenities
4 and open space. She asked what is being done with quality open space to make it a
5 community.

6
7 Discussion followed regarding the progress on the project.

8
9 Skelton encouraged the Commission to get their comments to staff on the first half of the
10 document as quickly as possible.

11
12 The Commission agreed to get comments to staff by the end of the week.

13
14 Todd reported to the Commission on upcoming projects, including: an apartment project
15 adjacent to Maple Knoll Apartments; a request for zoning change north of Dulello's; and
16 staff is anticipating Montessori School appearing before the APC after they appear before
17 the BZA.

18
19 **ADJOURNMENT** (9.55 p.m.)

20
21
22 Approved (date)

23
24
25 _____
26 President, Robert Smith, Esq.

27
28
29 _____
30 Vice President, Cindy Spoljaric

31
32
33 _____
Secretary, Matthew S. Skelton, Esq., AICP